



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

presuppositions of Christianity, which, without it, can be the religion of the most perfect morals, but not the religion of the redemption of mankind.

IV.

That part of the contents of the Pentateuch, which belongs to the substance of Christian faith, is independent of the results of critical analysis. That the people of Israel, after their miraculous deliverance, received the law by God's miraculous revelation in the mount of Sinai, and that Moses was the mediator both of Israel's deliverance and of the divine legislation, is confirmed by the unanimous testimony of all the writers who participated in its codification, by the Song of Deborah, (Judges v: 4-19) and by the prophets of the eighth century, as Amos ii: 10; Haggai xii: 13; Micah vi: 4 and viii: 15. The religiousness of such authentic Psalms of David as Psalms viii, xiv, xvi, is quite inconceivable without the priority of the revealed law, which David praises in Psalm xix.

V.

The oldest constituent part of the law is the Decalogue and the Book of Covenant, (Exodus xxii — xxiii), the overture of which is the Decalogue. In the Deuteronomy Moses repeats the Decalogue, and melts it in the current of his testamentary *parenthesis*. There is not any part of the Pentateuch, written according to its testimony by Moses himself, which may not be maintained as going back substantially to Moses' own hand; the proper style of Moses is the original base of that form of style which is called Jehovistic and Deuteronomic.

VI.

It is true that many, and, at least, four hands participated in the codification of the Pentateuchal history and legislation. But all that the modern critics say concerning the ages of these writings, is quite uncertain. In general, the results are not as unquestionable as they pretend to be. It would be bad if the faith of the church—that is, the historical certainty of the fundamental faith of redemption-history—were dependent on the critical results. Many of the former results are now out of fashion. We know little, and imagine we know much.

VII.

It is unjustifiable to obtrude the modern critical results upon the church, or to draw non-theologians into the labyrinth of Pentateuchal analysis. Without a knowledge of the original, an independent judgment about these questions is quite impossible. Indeed, Wellhausen's sagacity is as great as his frivolity; the most of our young scholars are fascinated by him. There are elements of truth in the new phase of Old Testament criticism, inaugurated by Graf; but the procedure of sifting has scarcely begun.

VIII.

The Mosaic legislation has its history and its codification; it is executed successively. The reconstruction of this history is very difficult, and perhaps impossible; but it is enough that the law has the very character which the Epistle to the Hebrews describes. Our Lord is its end; he has balanced the account-book with his blood. Moses and his Jehovists and Elohist are only shadows, which disappear before the Word made flesh.

THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.

BY

REV. KERR B. TUPPER.

In addition to the Hebrew (Massoretic) recension of the Pentateuch, scholars of our day have access to another form of the Mosaic Law, which has been preserved by the Samaritans, and called, in consequence of their relations to it, the Samaritan Pentateuch. This must be distinguished from the Samaritan Version.

I. ITS ORIGIN AND DATE

have been the occasion of much investigation and no little controversy. No less than five popular and widely-prevailing theories respecting the genesis of this text are abroad, which may be stated as follows:

(1). Some, on the ground of the remarkable resemblances between the LXX and this Pentateuch, have contended that the latter came into the possession of the Samaritans from Egyptian Jews, which position, they hold, is strengthened by the fact of the intimate relationships that, at one time, existed between these two peoples.

(2). Others defend the view that the LXX and the Samaritan have come independently from the same MSS. of the Pentateuch.

(3). Another theory held by some scholars of no mean repute is, that it was carried to the Samaritans by the priest Manasseh B. C., 320. cf. *Gesenius (De Sam. Pent)*; *Perowne ('Pentateuch' in Smith's Bib. Dict.)*. As bearing on this view it is interesting to read Prideaux's Connection (vi) which advocates the idea that the Samaritans were the recipients of Ezra's revised copy.

(4). Others see ground for the position that this Pentateuch was received by the Samaritans during the time of Hezekiah.

(5). Further still, such scholars as Davidson, Michaëlis, Bauer and Eichhorn hold that it was a gift to the Samaritans by the Ten Tribes under Jeroboam I.

We cannot here go into an examination of the respective claims upon scholars of these several hypotheses. Much that is said respecting the origin of this Pentateuch is only speculative. Against most, if not all, the views stated above there may be raised objections—objections founded chiefly in the absence of Samaritan history and in the paucity of collations between the various readings of the LXX and this Pentateuch. Except through quotations here and there of certain of the early Fathers (specially Origen and Jerome), we have no acquaintance with this text until the seventeenth century, when Morinus and Walton printed a copy of it which had been brought into Europe. (Cf. '*Samaria*' in *Herzog, Real-Encycl.*)

Of more interest and value than that of the origin of this Pentateuch is the question of

II. ITS COMPARISON WITH THE HEBREW.

No better arrangement, perhaps, of the variations between these two texts can be given than that furnished by Gesenius, who sums up the changes as follows: (1) Grammatical changes, substituting almost invariably the easier for the harder form. (2) Glosses. In Gen. vii: 2 אִישׁ וְאִשָּׁה ("man and woman"), because used of animals, is supplanted by זָכָר וְנִקְבָּה ("male and female"). Gen. xx: 3; xxv: 8. (3) Removal of apparent difficulties. In

Gen. XXIV: 62, **בא מבו** ("he came from going") is changed to **בא במדבר** ("he came through the desert"), which is the reading of the LXX. Gen. IX: 5 inserts **י** before **אחי**. Gen. XLI: 16 adds a negative so as to make the rendering, "God will not give." (4) Corrections from parallel passages; cf. Gen. I: 15 and I: 17, XI: 8 and XI: 4. It has been pointed out that the Samaritan Pentateuch invariably writes the name of Moses' father-in-law, *Jethro*, when other forms are used in the Hebrew text. (5) Interpolations. Ex. VII: 14-19 repeats vv. 16, 17, 18. Ex. XX: 17 repeats from Deut. XXVII: 2-8. (6) Changes in regard to matters that seemed improbable or were to the Samaritans offensive, cf. Ex. XII: 40; Gen. II: 2. (7) Hebrew idioms adapted to the Samaritan. (8) Conformity to the theology and religious preferences of the Samaritans. A striking illustration of this is where this text places singular verbs and adjectives to qualify *Elohim*, when the Hebrew always employs plural words, cf. Gen. XXXI: 53, XXXV: 7; Ex. XXII: 9. Anthropomorphisms are also carefully avoided, cf. Ex. XV: 3; Gen. XLIX: 7.

It is the opinion of a distinguished linguist that in two passages only does the Sam. Pent. seem to offer a better reading than the Hebrew. The first is, in Gen. IV: 8, where it reads, "And Cain said, Let us go into the field;" the second, Gen. XXII: 13, **אחר** instead of **אחר**, 'a ram' instead of 'a ram behind.'

We conclude this paper with a brief statement of the

III. RELATION BETWEEN THE SAMARITAN, SEPTUAGINT AND HEBREW.

(We are indebted for the summary that is here given to an eminent Oriental scholar of an Eastern University:)

In over 2000 places the Samaritan agrees with the LXX against the Hebrew.

In about 2000 places the Samaritan agrees with the Hebrew against the LXX.

In 19 places the Hebrew, Samaritan and New Testament agree.

In 3 places the LXX, Samaritan and New Testament agree.

For a more elaborate study of this whole question of the Samaritan Pentateuch, better authorities can not be recommended than Gesenius, '*De Sam. Pent. Origine*'; Hengstenberg, '*Authenticity of the Pentateuch*'; Davidson's '*Biblical Criticism*.'

"THE permanent, original, organic structure of the (Hebrew) language, its sublimity, its pathos, its simplicity, strength, conciseness, its searching, penetrating introversions, its expressions as earthquakes, its figurative power, its fitness at once for rural, peaceful and terrific imagery, the dew and the deluge, the soft descending showers, and the great rain of God's strength, its nervous compactness, and, at the same time, capacity of exuberant, gorgeous, fiery and seraphic eloquence, its proverbial and parabolic terseness, and intense concentration of thought and feeling, its equal facility for the highest possible grandeur and sweetest and most artless simplicity, whether of poetry or prose, its lightning flashes, points and diamonds, its creative spirituality, its watch-words of eternity and infinitude, all made it the hiding of God's power, a Shechinah of God's presence, the means of fulfilling God's predictions of the people that should dwell alone, and not be reckoned among the nations."—*Cheever*.

HARDENING PHARAOH'S HEART.

BY

MARTYN SUMMERBELL,

Prof. in Stamfordville Christian Institute, N. Y.

Little difficulty would be experienced in rightly weighing the character of the Pharaoh of the Exodus, had the Scriptural history simply narrated the succession of events, leaving the reader to picture for himself the motives for the inert and vacillating royal policy. A great monarch's reluctance to manumit in a body an extensive population of unpaid laborers, especially under dictation; his momentary prostration while smarting from the infliction of terrible judgments, and his speedy recovery when the immediate terror was overpast would have accounted for his course, with no need of search for remoter influences. And, in regard to Menptah, now generally accepted as the Pharaoh in question, the considerations mentioned would possess great force. Already an old man when the full power devolved upon him; too superstitious to do battle with the Shepherds, when they menaced the existence of his kingdom; inflated with a sense of his dignities, but unable to maintain them with the courage and fixed purpose of his renowned father Raamses II; glorying in the splendor of his war chariots, and yet grieving day by day at the growing independence of tributary nations, he seemed fitted by bent of mind and disposition to pursue such a career as that outlined in the Biblical story.

But lest the narrative of Scripture should be too simple it is complicated by allusions to a remoter cause for Pharaoh's obduracy. Repeatedly the statement occurs that the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart. In this manner a question has been raised as to the completeness of Pharaoh's responsibility, which, discussed from purely theological or metaphysical aspects, has occasioned much debate, seasoned with vituperations and recriminations, so that this Pharaoh, hundreds of centuries after his body was embalmed* and entombed with the gorgeous rites of his nation, may be credited with still causing confusion and thick darkness.

In all such matters the final appeal lies to the Scriptures; for which reason it may prove of interest to approach them directly and inquire their teaching regarding Pharaoh's heart. In this investigation, however, it will prove of decided gain to freely accept as a fact, what is so clearly and unassailably set forth, that the Lord gave a pledge to harden Pharaoh's heart, and also that, in some manner, the pledge was redeemed.

This hardening of Pharaoh's heart is mentioned in Exodus in nineteen several passages; in which the uniform word "harden" represents three distinct Hebrew roots. The relation of these nineteen subjects and predicates may possibly be more clearly understood by grouping them in tabular form as follows:

* This Menptah died in bed. The popular belief that he perished when his command was destroyed in the sea, lacks the support of Scripture.